

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

THERESE ROHLING PLATT,

Plaintiff,

v.

HOLLAND AMERICA LINE INC., ET AL.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-00062-JHC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. District courts “have inherent power to control their docket.” *Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc.*, 627 F.3d 402, 404 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. v. Hercules, Inc.*, 146 F.3d 1071, 1074 (9th Cir. 1998)); *see also Dietz v. Bouldin*, 579 U.S. 40, 47 (2016) (“[D]istrict courts have the inherent authority to manage their dockets and courtrooms with a view toward the efficient and expedient resolution of cases.”). Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), a case schedule may be modified if there is “good cause” and “the judge’s consent.”

The Court finds that good cause exists to modify the trial date. This case is set for trial on February 27, 2023. However, numerous motions are still pending. This includes a motion for summary judgment that will not note until February 17, just 10 days before trial. And the

1 Court's docket over the coming weeks is particularly busy. The Court is uncertain that it can  
2 resolve these motions with enough time to provide adequate notice to the parties.

3 Accordingly, the Court *sua sponte* ORDERS that the trial date be moved to April 24,  
4 2023. The Court DENIES as moot Plaintiff's motion to continue the trial date (which motion  
5 does not specify a new proposed trial date) (Dkt. # 55).<sup>1</sup> The Clerk is directed to enter a new  
6 scheduling order.

7 Dated this 27th day of January, 2023.

8  
9 

10 John H. Chun  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

---

22 <sup>1</sup> The Court's decision to continue the trial date is entirely independent of Plaintiff's motion to  
23 continue. The Court's decision rests solely on its own scheduling constraints. The Court expresses no  
24 opinion on the merits of Plaintiff's motion. But the parties are reminded of the Court's earlier statement  
that the Court will likely decline further requests to continue "[a]bsent extraordinary circumstances."  
Dkt. # 39 at 2.